

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7, 8 and 14 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 14 are amended only to clarify features of the invention previously discussed throughout prosecution, and do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Paula in the June 1, 2006 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments merely clarify features previously discussed throughout prosecution; and (b) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8-13, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Ma et al. (Ma), U.S. Patent No. 6,909,805. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the personal interview, Ma fails to disclose or suggest detecting annotations made to the document prior to image capture and extracting lesser portions of the original image of the document, the extracted portions being identified by the detected annotations, as recited in claims 1 and 8. Ma teaches, in Figs. 1 and 2, a method 10 for detecting and separating add-on handwritten annotations from a scanned document image 50 having printed text lines 52 and handwritten annotations 54 (col. 3, lines 39-42; col. 4, lines 12-18). As shown in steps 24 and 26 of Fig. 1, Ma teaches detecting and separating the printed text lines 52 from the handwritten annotations 54 by eliminating all the printed text

lines 52 from the scanned document image 50 (Fig. 1; col. 3, line 67 to col. 4, line 5; col. 7, lines 53-61; Figs. 7 and 8). Thus, in Ma, all of the printed text lines 52 are removed from the scanned document image 50. In contrast, claims 1 and 8 recite that lesser portions of the original image of the document are extracted. Lesser portions of the original image of the document are extracted, for example, to allow only important or relevant sections of the whole document image to be compiled as a summary of the original image of the document. Thus, because Ma fails to disclose or suggest detecting annotations made to the document prior to image capture and extracting lesser portions of the original image of the document, the extracted portions being identified by the detected annotations, Ma fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 8.

Because claims 2-6, 9-13, 17 and 18 incorporate the features of claims 1 and 8, Ma fails to disclose or suggest the features of any of these claims for at least the foregoing reasons as well as for the additional features found therein. Thus, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

Further, the amendments to claims 1 and 8 merely clarify the summary feature because a "lesser portion" of the original image of the document is consistent with the meaning of a summary as a condensed version of the original image of the document. The summary feature has been previously discussed throughout prosecution as distinguishing from Ma, which provides no condensed version of the original image of the document. Thus, because the summary feature has been previously discussed throughout prosecution as distinguishing from Ma, the amendments do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration.

The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ma in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,779 to Kurosawa et al. (Kurosawa). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the personal interview, Kurosawa fails to disclose or suggest a summary comprising hidden portions which are selectively expandable to increase the information in that portion of the summary, as recited in claims 7 and 14. Kurosawa teaches providing editing marks and editing an input image after the input image is scanned by a scanner. See Fig. 1, and col. 4, lines 4-7. For example, Kurosawa teaches inserting or deleting character images, e.g. letters, from the image document. See Figs. 6A-8C, and col. 6, lines 40-67. However, Kurosawa does not teach providing a summary comprising hidden portions which are selectively expandable to increase the information in that portion of the summary, as recited in claims 7 and 14.

As acknowledged by the Office Action, Ma fails to account for this deficiency. Thus, the combination of Ma and Kurosawa fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 7 and 14. Further, as discussed above, Ma fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 8. Kurosawa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ma with respect to claims 1 and 8. As such, the combination cannot suggest the subject matter of claims 7 and 14, which depend from claims 1 and 8, for at least those reasons as well, and for the additional features recited therein. Thus, the combination of Ma and Kurosawa also fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 7 and 14 because they depend from claims 1 and 8.

Further, the amendments to claims 7 and 14 merely clarify that the selectively expandable portions in the summary are "expandable" because they are hidden from view in layers until they are revealed by clicking different parts of a window for the summary, as explained in the Specification as filed on page 6, lines 13-29. The expandable portions

feature has been previously discussed throughout prosecution as distinguishing from Kurosawa. Thus, because the summary feature has been previously discussed throughout prosecution as distinguishing from Kurosawa, the amendments do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration.

Because claims 15 and 16 also incorporate the features of claims 1 and 8, the combination also fails to disclose or suggest the features of any of these claims for at least the foregoing reasons as well as for the additional features found therein. Thus, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ma in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,859,909 to Lerner et al. (Lerner). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Lerner fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ma with respect to claims 1 and 8. As such, the combination cannot suggest the subject matter of claims 19 and 20, which depend from claims 1 and 8, for at least those reasons as well as for the additional features recited therein. Therefore, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David R. Kemey
Registration No. 57,241

JAO:DRK/smo

Date: June 5, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
